DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 517 CE 033 197

AUTHOR DeSanctis, Vincent
TITLE The Adult Education Act 1964-1979: A Political History.
INSTITUTION National Adult Education Clearinghouse/National Multimedia Center for Adult Education, Upper Montclair, N.J.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 46p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Adult Education Clearinghouse, Montclair State College, Upper Montclair, NJ 07043 ($3.50).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Basic Education; *Adult Programs; Adults; American Indians; Educational Legislation; *Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; Older Adults
IDENTIFIERS *Adult Education Act 1966

ABSTRACT

The Adult Education Act, which provides federal funds for adult basic education (ABE) programs, has undergone many changes since enactment in 1964. Passage of ABE legislation as Title IIB under the Office of Economic Opportunity Act was a political solution for adult educators who had sought unsuccessfully for years for federal ABE legislation. Its association with manpower and antipoverty legislation was a temporary expedient resolved through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. A major change in ABE legislation was a broadening of the statement of purpose to include non-English speaking participants. The 1966 Adult Education Act also created a National Advisory Committee on ABE. The 1970 amendments reduced participant minimum age and revised the statement of purpose to permit participation of adults through completion of secondary school. The major change in the 1972 amendments concerned authorization of grants to improve educational opportunities for adult Indians. The 1974 amendments authorized grants for educational programs serving the elderly and provided that 15% of state grant funds were to be used for special projects and teacher training. The 1978 amendments retreated from encouragement of greater state control of ABE and reestablished discretionary funds at the federal level to support national priorities. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED2185517

The Adult Education Act 1964-1979: A Political History

By

Vincent De Sanctis

Assistant Professor

Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, IL

COPYRIGHT (C) 1979 - NATIONAL ADULT EDUCATION CLEARINGHOUSE,
MONCLAIR STATE COLLEGE, UPPER MONTCLAIR, NEW JERSEY 08043.

Published by:

National Adult Education Clearinghouse
Montclair State College
Center of Adult Continuing Education
Upper Montclair, NJ 08043

CE 033 197

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Frances M. Spinelli

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Dr. Vincent De Sanctis
Assistant Professor
Southern Illinois University
Edwardsville

Previous Positions include: Director of the HEW Region II Staff Development Project; Director of the Adult Education Resource Center, Montclair State College; and Dean of Continuing Education, Williamsport Area Community College.

INTRODUCTION

The Adult Education Act which provides federal funds for adult basic education programs has undergone many changes since its enactment in 1964. These changes have unquestionably reflected a combination of social and political forces operating in the larger society. Less visible, but no less important, have been the positions and priorities of individuals and organizations immersed in the ebb and flow of the policy-making process. The purpose of this paper is to identify the significant factors which led to its adoption and subsequent changes during its first fifteen years of existence, and to identify major actors who have participated in the development of this legislation. Much of the following description and analysis is based on congressional testimony and conference reports. The value of this documentary material has been enhanced immeasurably by numerous studies conducted by political scientists since the 1960s on the complex array of factors which affect the development of federal legislation.[1]

What follows is an effort to describe albeit in sketchy fashion the main features of and the major participants in the ABE political process and possibly reveal areas needing more detailed investigation. An important next step would be to conduct extensive interviews with the principals involved. A major premise of this paper is that while a great number of individuals have become involved in adult basic education at various levels only a handful of individuals can be credited with creating and nurturing the ABE program.

In an attempt to ease the readers burden in following the changes in the legislation significant milestones have been identified in TABLE 1.

TABLE 1

ADULT EDUCATION ACT

1964-1979

Legislative Event	Who Could Operate Programs	Age	Educational Level	Major Emphasis/Additions
Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-452)	State Education Agencies (SEA)	18	Less than H.S. Graduate	Read or Write the English language to obtain or retain employment.
Adult Education Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-750)	SEA	18	Less than H.S. Graduate	Changed to read overcome English language limitations to improve their ability to benefit from occupational training and otherwise increase their opportunities for more profitable and productive employment, and to make them better able to meet their adult responsibilities.
1968 Amendments (P.L. 90-247)	SEA, Private Nonprofit Agencies	18	Less than H.S. Graduate	Changed to read overcome English language limitations to improve their ability to benefit from occupational training and otherwise increase their opportunities for more profitable and productive employment, and to make them better able to meet their adult responsibilities.
1970 Amendments (P.L. 91-230)	SEA, Private Nonprofit Agencies	16	Less than H.S. Graduate	Complete high school and make available the means to secure training to make them more employable, productive, and responsible citizens.
1972 Amendments (P.L. 92-318)	SEA, Indian tribes, Institutions and Organizations	16	Less than H.S. Graduate	Complete high school and make available the means to secure training to make them more employable, productive, and responsible citizens.

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

ADULT EDUCATION ACT

1964-1979

Legislative Event	Who Could Operate Programs	Age	Educational Level	Major Emphasis/Additions
Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments 1973 (P.L. 93-291)	SEA, Indian tribes Institutions and Organizations	16	Less than H.S. Graduate	Authorized special projects for the elderly under the Adult Education Act.
1974 Amendments (P.L. 93-380)	SEA, Indian tribes, Institutions and Organizations	16	Less than H.S. Graduate	Added: bilingual adult education in English and where necessary in native language; special projects for the elderly; authorized the establishment of a clearinghouse.
Indochina Refugee Children Assistance Act of 1976 (P.L. 94-405)	SEA, Indian tribes Institutions and Organizations	16	Less than H.S. Graduate	Added: additional funds were made available in the Adult Education Act to provide educational programs for Indochina refugees adults.
1976 Amendments (P.L. 94-482)	SEA, Indian tribes, Institutions and Organizations.	16	Less than H.S. Graduate	Added: reduce to 10 percentum the amount states had to spend for special projects.
1978 Amendments (P.L. 95-961)	Added: Nonprofit Agencies	16	Less than H.S. Graduate	Added: establish a discretionary fund for national projects, permit nonprofit agencies to operate ABE programs under the supervision of authorized educational agencies.

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

ADULT EDUCATION ACT

1964-1979

Sources: National Advisory Council on Adult Education, An Historical Perspective: The Adult Education Act 1964-1974. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1976) pp. 13-33; National Advisory Council on Adult Education, Beyond the Verge. Washington: Government Printing Office 1977, p. 21; and U.S. Congress. Education Amendments of 1978. Conf. Rept. 95-1753, 95 Cong., 2nd sess. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1978), 227-233.

AN UNWANTED LIAISON

Passage of the ABE legislation as Title IIB under the Office of Economic Opportunity Act (OEO) in 1964 was a political solution for adult educators who had sought unsuccessfully for a number of years to have Congress pass adult basic education legislation. In 1961, and again in 1962, proposed adult education legislation was held by the House Rules Committee under the Chairmanship of Howard Smith (D-Virginia). Adult educators were quick to attribute their losses to the autocratic rule of Chairman Smith but more balanced assessments (14,15) suggest that Smith was reflecting a complex array of local and Congressional feelings, personalities and procedures of the House which tends to temper the view that Smith was the only hurdle.

The Kennedy administration sought to pass an aid-to-education bill in the face of increasing, and often conflicting, pressures for equality of education for blacks, the demands of Catholics for a piece of any general aid-to-education bill, and the authority of Chairman Smith operating within the rules of the House of Representatives. In 1962, under the chairmanship of Congressman Carl Perkins (D-Kentucky), the Select Subcommittee on Education heard testimony in both Washington, D.C. and in Morehead, Kentucky (located in Perkins' congressional district) on proposed legislation to support adult basic education programs. In his 1962 education message to Congress, Kennedy said:

economic results of this lack of schooling is often chronic

> unemplyment, dependency or deliquency, with all the consequences this entails for these individuals, their families, their communities, and the Nation. The twin tragedies of illiteracy and dependency are often passed on from generation to generation (8:115)

Testimony at the five days of hearings documented quite convincingly the extent and nature of adult illiteracy in the United States. Wilbur Cohen, assistant secretary for HEW, in assessing the evidence, stated:

> Now, what do these statistics mean in day-to-day human terms? In many cases, they mean that these people can not read labels on medicine bottles, voting ballots, job applications and other forms, help-wanted columns in the newspapers, advertisements, and traffic instructions, children's school report cards, and the Bible (21:8)

The rationale of Cohen and numerous others for eliminating this blight was that the costs of illiteracy and educational deprivation were extensive, that there was an increasing need for skilled manpower, that public welfare costs were mounting, and the level of national defense preparedness was adversely affected.

A second issue evident in these 1962 Hearings concerned the purpose of the Act. Perkins suggested that the original bill which stressed "unable to read or write" be accepted over the second bill which read "who are unskilled in reading or writing English." Cohen argued that the word basic should appear in the title to insure that "it not be perceived as an across-the-board program." Robert Luke, Executive Secretary of the National Association for Public School Adult Education (NAPSAE),[2] expressed the view that adult education had a higher status than a term with literacy or basic in it. It would appear that Perkins' more narrow emphasis was strategic inasmuch as he wanted to minimize

the nature of the legislation to insure its passage.

State rights was another issue that repeatedly surfaced. The reason for initiating the program was to provide funds to states overtaxed by increasing demands for elementary, secondary and higher education. The Act was to encourage the development of state department competence in adult education. As noted in the testimony of Dr. Roy Minnis, Adult Education Specialist in the USOE, 12 states had one full-time adult educator, nine plus the District of Columbia had someone providing leadership as part of other assignments, and 22 states had no one assigned the responsibility for adult education. But in enhancing the states' capabilities the federal government was to have no direct control. Perkins, sensitive to the states rights issue, found repeated opportunities to introduce into the record his aversion to federal usurpation of state control over education, hoping to allay the fears of his states rights' colleagues. In a rather lengthy exchange with the state director of adult education from Mississippi, W.E. Williams, Perkins and Roman Pucinski (D-Illinois) were able to highlight this position (21: 303-307).

Unable to obtain adult basic education legislation through an aid-to-education bill the NAPSAE/NEA (National Education Association) Legislative Committee with the day-to-day political work of Tom McLernon, assistant to Robert Luke at NEA, decided to ride the coattails of the OEO legislation.[3] Although he displayed little interest in their proposal Sargent Shriver, Director of OEO, reluctantly agreed

to support the section (Title 11B) added by the House Education and Labor Committee. An adult educator (27:1264) at the 1966 testimony characterized Shriver as objecting "strenously," Sar Levitan (9:44), in his history of Economic Opportunity Act, attributed the original omission of a basic education component by the Shriver task force to the belief that "funds for this activity could be provided from CAP grants," although the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations' (1) suggestion that it was Shriver's belief that OEO was a poverty program not an educational program may be more accurate. The Deputy Director of the Shriver "task force," Adam Yarmolinsky (35), in a retrospective description of the origins of OEO, makes no mention of the role of the USOE administered ABE program although it was funded through OEO.

Although it was part of the OEO funding request, Title 11B was to be administered by the U.S. Office of Education through grants to state departments of education; strong evidence that the 1962 testimony before Perkin's Subcommittee accurately reflected the views of those most interested in ABE legislation. Luke testified in 1963 before the House Select Subcommittee on Labor that:

> References to other appropriate education agencies clearly and precisely authorized the basic education aspects of the proposed expansion of the Manpower Development and Training Act to be undertaken by that part of State and Local school systems (usually the general adult education divisions) with the longest and most appropriate background of experience in planning and administering programs of basic education. (31:547)

While understandable, this position was somewhat strained in view of the 1963 USOE statistics which showed that only 160 out of 15,200 school systems offered adult basic education. Only a handful of the states had

a full-time official in charge of adult education.

The legislation sought, and subsequently obtained by adult educators, grew out of a long history of interest in eliminating adult illiteracy. The historic mission of the USOE Bureau of Adult Education and the handful of states involved in adult education was in literacy education. Literacy prior to the 1962 Hearings and the 1964 legislation was sought as a desirable goal in itself, that is, as a second chance to acquire the basic skills traditionally obtained in elementary school. In the early 1960s traditional literacy definitions were simultaneously reinforced and challenged by a series of developments which are noted below.

One such development was the concept of human capital.[4] By the early 1960s many economists were presenting convincing evidence that education was a significant factor in economic expansion. In effect, education was an investment which brought returns to both the individual and society. A corollary to this human capital concept was the recognition that people were poor because they lacked skills necessary to obtain and retain employment. In testimony in 1963 before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel (10:339) observed "we need leadership and financial aid by the Federal Government as well as State and local government for a thoroughgoing drive against this enemy to economic progress and increased productivity." An observation and recommendation of the Senate Subcommittee was that:

> Adult education is the best guarantee of a flexible labor force adaptable to shifts in the nature of the job opportunities available in the labor market. Enactment of adult education provisions similar to those contained in the administrations's 1963 omnibus education bill would be a small first step in adding a vital part to a national manpower development program. (470-471)

Level of literacy was identified as a major explanation as to why individuals were or were not receiving public aid. One witness, Raymond Hilliard, Director of the Cook Country (IL) Department of Public Aid, testified (24:1481-1504) in 1964 before the House Subcommittee on the War on Poverty Program that his program was successful in enabling public aid recipients to obtain employment after they had received literacy training to correct their "educational deficiencies." This belief in adult basic education as a remedy for the elimination of "educational deficiencies" was echoed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity (17:48-49).

In 1964 the Adult Basic Education program as Title IIB of the OEO Act was enacted into law. But its association with manpower and anti-poverty legislation, much of which was established outside the traditional public school system, was a temporary expedient to be resolved in 1966 through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The original intent of its congressional backers clearly suggested that the Act was envisioned as far more than a anti-povery effort.

> An overriding consideration is that the learning tools of reading, writing, and arithmetic open the door of opportunity not only to occupational training and productive work, but also to the larger life of the mind and spirit. The illiterate or near illiterate person, while employed, may be shut out from a whole world of personal growth

> opportunities. Adult basic education is a fundamental approach to independent learning, to adjustment of manpower to changing occupation requirements, to elimination of poverty, and to the larger satisfactions in personal growth made possible through acquisition of the basic learning tools (24:16).

This original intent has persisted as evidenced by Ulin's (19) exhaustive content analysis of all pertinent testimony between 1962 and 1974.

ABE RETURNS TO THE FOLD

Within one year of the passage of the OEO legislation hearings were conducted before the Subcommittee on the War on Poverty Program, chaired by William Ford (D-Michigan), to re-examine the ABE program's progress. Adam Clayton Powell (Chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor), asked (30: 54-55) Edward Brice (Director of the Division of Adult Education) why the adult education program was moving slowly. Brice responded that "plans were moving along which for states was very quick." Shriver, in somewhat of an aside, commented "Yes, it is phenomenal for a State Plan. Just remember we didn't say that it ought to be done by State Plan." This short exchange hinted at the underlying conflict between USOE commitment to state bureaucratic involvement and the more anti-establishment bent of the OEO staff.

Additional issues to emerge in the same hearings (30: 679-735) concerned whether the basic education effort was a literacy program or a job preparation program, the difficulty in defining adult literacy, the need to develop instructional materials appropriate to adults, and whether or not the requirement of poverty should be eliminated, a posi-

tion more appropriate to a USOE in contrast to an OEO administered program. Chairman Ford commented (30:720) that he was hopeful that section 212 which addressed the basic literacy concept could be "separate from the very direct type of training" that was discussed in the Manpower Development and Retraining Act and vocational education. He added that in his view "we are trying now to do for our citizens what we did during periods of heavy immigration for people who didn't have the reading and writing skills to become part of the Community."

The 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was the culmination of a long struggle by supporters of increased federal support for education (4, 12). Unlike the anti-poverty legislation of OEO this legislation was designed to strengthen USOE - state education agency (SEA) - local education agency (LEA) relationships. Congressional supporters, particularly Carl Perkins (D-Kentucky), were very interested in disassociating ABE from OEO. In 1966 subcommittee hearings Luke testified to the need to move ABE from OEO to the proposed ESEA legislation. His statement read in part:

> However, since this is so obviously an educational function - so necessarily related to state departments of education, so closely aligned in purpose to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we would propose that the members of this Subcommittee give consideration to the transferring of the Adult Basic Education Section of the Economic Opportunity Act to the Office of Education and extending the program in such a way that individuals who meet the established criteria may secure either a high school equivalency certificate or an adult high school diploma under provisions of this Act (28:979).

Chairman Perkins subsequently asked Dr. Luke if he had testified before the "poverty people." Luke said no but he would like a chance to testify. In fact his assistant Jim Dorland did submit a statement for the record before the "poverty people" but did not have an opportunity to testify. This exchange revealed Perkins' support for such a transfer, as did a question raised by Congressman Bell (28:903): "So, actually, adult education, would you say, does not belong in the Poverty Act because there are many people throughout the country that are not necessarily in poverty that deserve to have an opportunity for an adult education?" Dr. Luke responded in the affirmative. Adam Clayton Powell, Chairman of both the Committee on Education and Labor as well as the Subcommittee on the War on Poverty Program pursued the same point with Edward Brice, Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Education, when he asked if the Office of Education could handle the ABE program without creating a new agency. Brice cautiously replied (32:406): "I feel that the national thrust or focus in administrative control of such a program might very well be vested in The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare." Powell and Perkins were clearly signaling their support for such a transfer. The adult education strategists had done their work well.

One event in the education hearing should be noted because it highlighted a time-honored technique for working with Congressmen. Dr. Luke (28:986) was given permission to read into the record that recently the "California Council for Adult Education held its annual meeting in Los Angeles and presented Congressman Bell with an honorary award." In

concluding his testimony Dr. Luke (28:987) once again requested and received permission to insert into the record that the number one copy of an annual publication was being given to "Congressman Perkins because we list in there that he is one of the distinguished award winners of the National Association for Public School Adult Education." Attention to the "needs" of Congressmen was to characterize future hearings in adult education.

The major change in the ABE legislation was a broadening of the statement of purpose which previously read to enable individuals to read and write the English language to obtain or retain the employment. Under ESEA it was restated to read: "overcome English language limitations to improve their ability to benefit from occupational training and otherwise increase their opportunities for more profitable and productive employment, and to make them better able to meet their adult responsibilties" (emphasis added). ABE could now include participants who needed English as a second language, a change which greatly increased the participation of non-English speaking enrolled in programs, many of whom had high school diplomas from their native country. The language in the Act "to meet their adult responsibilities" was deliberately vague. It was to be the basis for subsequent diversity in ABE curriculum development and would provide the basic ingredient for more expansive interpretations of literacy.

Support for state departments of education was reflected in the 1962 Hearings as well as in subsequent administration of ABE. As was

previously noted state department efforts and services in adult education were probably more uneven in quality and quantity than those for their elementary, secondary and higher education counterparts.

The 1966 Adult Education Act also created a National Advisory Committee on Adult Basic Education. This Presidentially-appointed eight member Committee, chaired by the Commissioner of Education, was to advise the Commissioner on the administration of the Act, to review the administration and effectiveness of the ABE program and other federally supported adult education programs, and to make annual reports to the President. There is little evidence that the Advisory Committee on Adult Basic Education, chaired by a very busy Commissioner of Education, and without a full-time professional staff, had much of a role to play during its first few years. Like most education groups adult educators sought access to the policy making process by working through the key staff members of the appropriate congressional committees.

THE MATURING OF ABE

No substantive changes occurred as a result of the 1968 Amendments to the Adult Education Act. The 1970 Amendments, however, were significant. For one, the minimum age of eligible participants was reduced from 18 to 16 years of age. This change was in response to the recognition that the 16 year old high school dropout was being denied further education opportunities for up to two years. It also was consistent with increased demands on the part of the states to ex-

pand the ABE program through secondary completion.

A second, and more substantial, change was the revision in the statement of purpose which was to permit the participation of adults through completion of secondary school. This change was confirmation that ABE participants were seeking high school equivalency (GED) certificates. When adult basic education legislation was originally established funding to the states was to be based on the number of adults with less than sixth grade education. In the 1970 Amendments the formula was based on the proportion of adults not enrolled in school and who did not have certificates of graduation from secondary school. Congressional intent (29:96) regarding the change indicated that it was supported only to the extent that ABE needs had been met. During the hearing Congressman Ford (D-Michigan) repeatedly expressed concern over the de-emphasis on basic education. Adult educators have long known that it is much easier to recruit and retain participants seeking a credential - the GED, than for the more nebulous concept of literacy, however defined. Pressure for this change was brought by those states who saw an opportunity to support adult secondary programs (GED and regular evening schools). State pressure for minimizing restrictions on the extent on high school level participation has been unyielding to the present.

While the states were moving steadily towards increased support for GED level ABE programs, the USOE through its control of special project (309B and 309C) funds, had established the foundation for a redefinition of illiteracy that was in direct contrast to actual practice in the

1960s with the GED credential pursuit of the state ABE program, but more consistent with the broader intent suggested at its inception. Recall Wilbur Cohen's previously cited testimony.

Included in the adult education legislation were provisions for discretionary funds to be retained by USOE to provide leverage with the states to address national rather than more local priorities. As Orfield, in analyzing the ESEA legislation, has noted (13:130-131) "there was an implicit assumption that the education establishment needed incentives to respond to critical education problems that it had hitherto ignored." Paul Delker, Director of the Division of Adult Education, in a 1968 interview, confirmed (18:206) the validity of this observation when he was quoted as saying: "In the Adult Basic Education Program we have $40 million funding of which $30 million goes to the states. We have little control over it. But of the $10 million we have we can make grants for various projects over which we have full control."

Discretionary funds serve an important function in the political process. In 1971 these special funds were used to fund a project to identify those skills and knowledge needed by adults to successfully survive in society. The effort known as the Adult Performance Level Project (APL) sought, in effect, to move the ABE program away from grade level definitions of adult literacy while also countering the standardize testing approach of GED. Long before the APL findings had been properly assessed curriculum developers were jumping on the bandwagon to prepare APL curriculum materials. Some critics of

APL such as Griffith and Cervero (6) and Mezirow (11) have argued that life skill objectives may be representative of a minority of Americans at best and that such objectives could lead to a national curriculum, a development that has been anathema to educators historically.

A number of adult educators, many of whom who had either worked in the Peace Corps or with Third World literacy programs, or were stimulated by those who had (5,7), were leaders in supporting or developing definitions of literacy that challenged the traditional grade level definitions historically used by USOE and the state departments of education. Through discretionary funds the Division of Adult Education was able to encourage the development of projects such as those at the Educational Policy Research Center (Syracuse University Reserach Corporation), World Education, Inc. (a literacy organization in New York) and the Appalachian Center at Morehead State University in Kentucky, each of which explored alternative definitions and strategies for working with illiterate adults. While such concepts as "conscientization" and "civic literacy" received little attention from practitioners the concept of functional literacy[5] has received much attention.

Another significant change in the 1970 Amendments was the establishment of a 15 member, Presidentially-appointed National Advisory Council on Adult Education to replace the earlier eight member National Advisory Committee on Adult Basic Education. This Council, unlike its precedessor, selected its own Chairperson, rather than having the

Commissioner of Education serve in that capacity. The Council would also have for the first time an Executive Director. Dr. Gary Eyre, Director of Adult Education for Colorado, was appointed to the position. This larger and more effectively supported advisory group would begin to play a larger part in the ABE legislative process. Part of its increased role was reflected in the deletion of the word "Basic" from the title. The significance of this deliberate change was to minimize the stigmatizing perceptions of the Adult Education Act as a program for illiterates and broaden the definiton of the target population."

THE PARTNERSHIP LOSES ITS EQUILIBRIUM

The major change in the 1972 Amendments concerned the addition of a section authorizing grants to improve educational opportunities for adult Indians. In 1971 Congress conducted extensive hearings on the educational needs of Indians. These hearings, generated in no small part by the increased public concern for the American Indian, resulted in a section to be added to the Adult Education Act. In addition the 1972 legislation included an authorization for some $3,000,000 in 309c funds for teacher training. These funds were to be used to support staff development projects in each of the ten HEW rerions.

During its infancy supporters of the ABE recognized that there was a scarcity of trained personnel to staff ABE programs. Intensive two and three week summer institutes were conducted on college campuses throughout the country. This emergency, sporadic training was

essential at first, but it was deemed a short-term solution at best. The states in HEW Region IV decided to establish a firmer foundation for staff development by supporting graduate programs. Through a 309c Teacher Training grant a regional program was implemented in 1969. Because USOE judged the Region IV Staff Development Project a success the decision was made in 1971 to establish comparable projects in the other nine regions. These projects, established in 1972, were to last three years although some were supported by some states in modified form beyond the three-year period. Because of circumstances unique to each region the projects varied considerably, many adhering in only the most superficial way to the original staff development directive issued in 1971 by Robert Worthington, Associate Commissioner for Occupational and Adult Education. From a funding perspective these projects represented the largest effort by USOE to affect the priorities of the states. The projects were also to unintentionally surface long standing issues regarding the role USOE should play vis-a-vis the states.

The 1974 Amendments authorized the Commissioner to make grants for educational programs serving the elderly, an example of how the Adult Education Act serves as an access point for organized interest. Because of its relatively flexible definition ABE has been susceptible to various political pressures. State directors have no objection to serving special groups but they believe funds for these groups should be beyond the funds allocated for operation of regular programs. The needs of persons of limited English-speaking ability was also specifically cited in the Amendments. In the early 1970s there was increas-

ing criticism of the melting-pot concept and the belief by many that instruction in the native language might be the most effective means to reach non-English speaking adults. The Adult Education Act ever subject to each change in the winds affecting Congressional politics included this amendment, although there was little evidence to suggest much support for the idea from the states. In fact the most striking characteristic of the testimony regarding the inclusion of special groups has been the absence of any meaningful discussion.

The most significant change, however, was the provision that 15 percent of state grant funds were to be used for special projects and teacher training, eliminating the USOE discretionary funds. Authority for sponsoring 309 Projects changed from USOE to the state departments of education. The conference report (26:189) noted that the Senate acceded to the House, an indication of the latter's greater sensitivity to state concerns. Reasons for this change are complex but an explanation resides somewhere between the state departments of education believing that they were quite capable (unlike during the mid-1960s) of identifying their own training and special projects priorities, not to mention controlling the extra funds, and a reaction to what they believed was too much independence by USOE. The latter represented a belief that the Division of Adult Education had goals and educational philosophies not always compatible with SEAs and LEAs. An early incident in the ABE program's history exemplifies this issue. In 1968, Grant Venn, then Associate Commissioner of Vocational-Tech-

nical Education, authorized an adult education project grant to Operation Breadbasket, a Chicago based black organization headed by Reverend Jessie Jackson. Ven (16:144-145) soon found himself being chastised by Wilber Cohen, HEW Secretary, within hours after a phone call from a Chicago Congressman, Roman Pucinski, member of the Daley organization. Venn, based on misinformation, as he termed it, had been perceived as undermining a local political organization.

The ABE program is somewhat unique in that it was and continues to be a higher priority at the SEA rather than the LEA level. Few school districts accord adult basic education much of a priority. This lack of interest and the fact that state directors have been in effort the unofficial spokesmen for an essentially unorganized clientele created a vacuum which was filled by the sudden acquisition of funds. State directors of adult education acquired substantial power over LEA programs although their status vis-a-vis other state officials has rarely been high. As was noted earlier the USOE mandate to establish regional staff development projects, specifically through a memorandum identifying 17 criteria, was coopted by the states. What was important for HEW Region IV was not necessarily important for others. Moreover, the projects created a focus of potential influence within the states but outside their complete control that was unacceptable.

With the demise of special project funds the nature of the Division of Adult Education's influence approximated the observation of

Berke and Kirst who, after studying the influence of 575 school districts, noted:

> USOE exercises control through its regulations that have the force of law and the guidelines that interpret the "legalise" in the regulations. Guidelines also include a mixture of USOE advice and suggestions which are legally non-binding. Some USOE programs employ periodic and supplementary program memoranda which presumably clarify regulations and are effectively legal mandates. These three different instruments of federal control - regulations, guidelines, and memoranda confuse SEAs and LEAs. This confusion permits slippage and evasion, especially when supplementary federal program memoranda have changed longstanding policies (3:377-378).

This "slippage and evasion" allowed ABE programs to support high school equivalency programs above the earlier 20 percent maximum. It also permitted the states to mold the regional projects into what they wanted rather than USOE. The Division of Adult Education, like most governmental units, can not long function without its clientele group. To retain this support it must of necessity accede to the wishes of the state directors of adult education. But within this relationship there is also an implicit understanding that while political actors and policies come and go the permanent bureaucracy has accumulated the expertise so vital to maintaining continuity between administrations and is the source of assurance to Congressional committees that the program is accomplishing its objectives.

THE EQUILIBRIUM RESTORED

The adult education hearings held in July 1977 before the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, chaired

by Carl Perkins, epitomized the various roles of the Congress-agency clientele group relationships that have evolved since the early 1960s. These roles have attained a high degree of consistency. The witnesses who testified were Paul Delker, Director of the USOE Division of Adult Education (a position he has held since 1968), Dr. Gary Eyre, Executive Director of the National Advisory Council on Adult Education (a position he has held since 1971), Dr. Curtis Ulmer, current President of the National Association for Public Continuing and Adult Education (accompanied by Executive Director James Dorland, successor to Dr. Robert Luke, who had represented NAPCAE at these hearings since 1962), and Dr. William Flowers representing both the Adult Education Association and the National University Extension Association (accompanied by Dr. Linda Hartsock, Executive Director, AEA, an organization which has for a variety of reasons taken a back seat to NAPCAE in adult education hearings).

The testimony of Paul Delker reflected the difficult position the USOE must play vis-a-vis the state departments of education. When asked by the Committee possible explanations for the inability of the ABE program to serve the lowest level adult illiterate he attributed (22:5-6) this failure to the "preference of local adult educators to serve the adults who are demanding high school diploma programs." While true this statement failed to acknowledge that local directors are responsible to state directors of adult education who do have the authority to direct program emphasis. Since the removal of discretionary funds the USOE has had its influence base narrowed substantially. The one area in which it has continued

to provide leadership is in the development of the APL (Adult Performance Level) program which has given USOE a strong identification with competency-based education a currently popular favorite of politicians and education officials alike. The USOE has become essentially a one issue operation as exemplified in recent publications, congressional testimony and workshop activities. This one issue though appears to have tremendous potential to affect state-administered programs as evidenced by Paul Delker's observation (22:61): "That a redirection of the Adult Education Act in which we shift the educational objectives from high school completion criteria to attaining functional competence as measured and established by the adult performance level study is indicated."

The National Advisory Council, represented by Gary Eyre, submitted a statement that was a detailed item-by-item analysis of the existing legislation accompanied by a series of issues which the Council was encouraging the Committee to review. The Council's statement then concluded with a priority list of recommendations for the Committee's consideration. Unlike the Division the Council's mandate is enhanced in an era of diminished federal control over categorial programs.

The testimony of NAPCAE unabashedly reflected the view of the state directors of adult education. Curtis Ulmer's testimony referred to a survey distributed to members. The results were overwhelmingly in favor of leaving the Adult Education Act alone. Quoting Jim Dorland, Curtis Ulmer said "If it's not broke, don't fix it," although NAPCAE did want removal of the 20 percent maximum for funds for secondary completion

leaving it to the discretion of the states as well as a reduction in the percentage of money to be spent for institutionalized programs. Essentially changes were sought which would increase the state's flexibility in operating the program, a tendency in federal programs which has been noted by others. Unlike NAPCAE, with its clearly defined constituency, the testimony of NUEA and AEA was essentially a philosophical statement in support of adult education. In terms of the Adult Education Act, NAPCAE, as the representative of local and state directors of adult education, remains the leading interest group.

The Committee, chaired by Carl Perkins, evinced much support for adult education. Questioning by the old-timers on the Committee such as Perkins and Quie (R-Minnesota) was clearly supportive. Perkins expressed (22:6) the view that he felt that the Adult Education Act was one of the "most deserving and worthwhile programs which the Congress has enacted since about 1964." When Gary Eyre recalled that the Council's earlier plan to conduct a needs assessment was denied support by Congressman Flood (D-Pennsylvania), Quie responded (22:68) that "maybe we ought to make sure we can do it in such a way that Mr. Flood can't stop it." With this pronounced support the less predictable questions of the newer Committee members were handled comfortably.

The 1977 hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities revealed that the adult education community was displeased with Assistant Secretary Mary Berry's October 4 testimony.

Dr. Berry referred (34:49) to "evaluations" which found "that few of the target population participate, and that even when they do participate, relatively few are helped by the program" and that teaching methods "offensive to adults" and which "work poorly" were being used. Dr. Eyre in his October 13 testimony asserted (34:571-572) that the first point was in contrast to what was actually known about the program's success, and that the second point may have been true ten years ago, but was inconsistent with the extensive training received by adult educators in recent years.

On February 28, 1978 Secretary of HEW, Joseph Califano presented testimony to the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education on Carter's education proposals. Recommendations for the Adult Education Act included (33:90-91): (1) revision of the Act to include an emphasis on functional literacy; (2) expansion of the universe of eligible providers of adult education; (3) requiring the states to expand their service delivery system, and (4)adding a new research, development, dissemination and evaluation authority at the federal level. The recommendation regarding functional literacy was support for the extensive attention devoted by the Division of Adult Education to this issue since 1971. The second recommendation, based on the 1977 testimony, was only identified by the National Advisory Council, and then only in a cautiously worded manner. This recommendation, in the absence of any significant public evidence based on Congressional hearings, was

apparently coming from within the Administration, in particular Dr. Mary Berry. The final recommendation was a reflection of the belief that the 1974 decision to transfer control over the special projects from the federal to the state level had created a void in terms of addressing national priorities. The 1978 appropriation hearings suggested (20) that some Congressmen were critical of USOE spending money that did not get returned to the states.

The subsequent report issued by the Subcommittee clearly indicated that they believed the Administration recommendation should be implemented because the needs of the least educated adults "have not been adequately met to date." Further, in response to the state directors of adult education position as expressed in the NAPCAE testimony, the report warned (27:128) that "now is not the time to loosen up the requirements of the Act to spend more funds on those who are better educated and closer to achieving high school equivalency."

The 1978 conference report of the Education Amendments of 1978 revealed (27) that the ABE legislation had retreated somewhat from the 1970's trend (percipitated by the block grant philosophy of the Nixon and Ford Administration) of encouraging greater state control over all facets of the adult basic education program. The continual attempt of the state directors to remove restrictions as to how much funding could be directed towards secondary completion had been seemingly thwarted. Congress took the occasion to reemphasize that the original intent of the legislation was "basic" education. The USOE's emphasis on functional literacy was incorporated into the language.

Finally, discretionary funds were reestablished at the federal level to support national priorities. On November 1, 1978 President Carter signed the legislation into law.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In tracing the evolution of the adult basic education legislation from 1964 through 1979 certain broad themes persist. One such theme is the dynamic rather than static nature of the purpose of the legislation. The original intent that the Act was created to address "basic" adult education has not been forgotten. There has been, however, continual pressure, particularly on the part of state directors of adult education to interpret basic as meaning education through secondary completion. The emphasis on acquisition of a credential - the GED - has been resisted. The intent has been modified by the acceptance of the concept of functional literacy - an idea that emerged from the belief that the potential ABE participant lacked a great variety of survivial skills that transcended traditional literacy skills. The Division of Adult Education's persistence in supporting and pursuing the implications of the APL Project has placed the Division squarely in the forefront of the competency-based education (CBE) movement, a combination of foresight and good fortune that has enhanced the Division's image.

The dynamics of the federal-state relations is a second theme. During the euphoria of the 1960s the ABE program benefited from a belief that strong federal leadership was necessary to solve national problems, although as previously noted from the very beginning Congress

and the federal bureaucracy encouraged a strong state role. Filling a leadership vacuum the Division of Adult Education, through its discretionary funds, operated in a fairly free-wheeling manner. This situation was to be short-lived as state directors of adult education began to exercise their political muscle through the National Association of Public School Adult Education (NAPSAE),[6] subsequently renamed the National Association of Public Continuing Adult Education (NAPCAE). Politically, the directors were supported by administrations (Nixon and Ford) oppossed to categorical aid, although Congress successfully resisted attempts to eliminate categorical aid programs. The peak of state political influence occurred in 1974 when Congress eliminated the Commissioner's discretionary funds by redirecting special projects funds to the states. The leadership of the Division was muted during this period by the antibureaucratic stance of the administration. The Carter Administration, less obsessed with detailed control over the bureaucracy, has engendered an atmosphere more supportive of a Division still seeking to exercise leadership. The more openly critical stance of the Division Director in the 1977 hearings regarding the states' priorities would suggest this was so. The inclusion of discretionary funds in the education Amendments of 1978 revealed continued congressional recognition of the states' preeminent role but balanced by an equal need to address national priorities.

A third theme evident in this review is the almost ritualistic behavior exhibited by the actors. The pattern for the ABE legislative process was set in the early 1960s. Advocates for ABE legislation acquired the interest and commitment of Congressman Carl Perkins (D-

Kentucky), Chairman of the subcommittee responsible for the adult education legislation. Perkins, supported by then Chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Adam Clayton Powell (D-New York), has been a consistent supporter of the legislation as typified by his laudatory remarks in the 1977 hearings.

State local directors of adult education have been represented by Robert Luke and, since the late 1960s by Jim Dorland. In this capacity they have consistently espoused the persisting views of the state directors that the "Adult Education Act" should permit maximum freedom for the states to determine the amount of funds to be directed to secondary level completion as contrasted with an exclusive emphasis on basic education. Undoubtedly Bailey was right in suggesting that with few exceptions professional education associations had limited influence in the 1960s, but state directors of adult education appear to have been well-served by their association. The other leading organizations - AEA (because of its much broader constituency) and NUEA (because of its other priorities) have been less visible participants.

The USOE Division of Adult Education was formally a low-keyed operation concerned with providing advice and statistics and very supportive of a strong state involvement in adult education (in spite of the very limited number of states involved), but the "Adult Education Act" created a new ballgame.[7] The discretionary funds provided the Division an opportunity to exert leadership. In 1968, Paul Delker, a former Peace Corps administrator, as was his immediate predecessor Jules Pagano, became and remains to date Director of the Division. Delker

has demonstrated much flexibility in adjusting to various administrative policies by changing from an activist role in the 1960s to a more subdued one during the Republican era to a less cautious role in the Carter Administration.

In 1970 a presidentially appointed fifteen member National Advisory Council on Adult Education was created. Appointed Executive Director was Gary Eyre. Since his appointment Eyre has worked to create an effective counterpart to the understandably more narrow interests of NAPCAE and the politically restricted USOE Division of Adult Education. Because of its composition and its rather open charge the Council can explore, debate and suggest consideration of issues that are not likely to emerge from other sources. The Council has acquired a great deal of political credibility since 1971. In the main, NAPCAE, the Division and the Council complement each other well as evidenced in the 1977 hearings. Their outward solidarity strengthens the position of politicians like Carl Perkins.

The final theme concerns the susceptability of the ABE program to the numerous other educational programs and ideas that have regularly appealed to Congress. Since its inception the ABE program has been amended to include efforts to deal with adult Indians, the elderly, the institutionalized, community schools, bilingual, Vietnamese refugees and in 1978, immigrants. The response of educators to these Congressional interests has been varied, but in general the ABE program, embedded in the state education agency - local education agency relationship, has related to these special needs in direct proportion

to the availability of additional funds and to the extent to which these needs are compatible with existing practices or state priorities. For example, some states have historically supported institutionalized adults at a high level while others have not. Some states supported English as a Second Language program for immigrants long before enactment of the 1978 amendments.

The attempt in this paper has been to highlight some of the significant political aspects of adult basic education by describing and analyzing the public records. The events and issues described above are well known to a number of individuals including many already mentioned. However, there are far more individuals involved in ABE who are quite unfamiliar with this story. To those individuals this paper is directed.

FOOTNOTES

1. Particularly helpful in understanding the roles of the various elements in the legislative process were Richard Fenno, Jr., Congressmen in Committee (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1973); David Vogler, The Third House: Conference Committee in the United States Congress (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1971) and The Politics of Congress (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974), especially chapter 5; J. Leiper Freeman, The Political Process: Executive Bureau-Legistative Committee Relations, revised edition (New York: Random House, 1965); David Price, Who Makes the Laws? (Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1972), particularly pp. 1-24; Kenneth Kofmehl, Professional Staffs of Congress (West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Studies, 1962), especially pp. 110-117; Harry Summerfield, Power and Process (Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1974); Hugh Heclo, A Government of Strangers (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1977); Gary Orfield, Congressional Power: Congress and Social Change (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1975); and Martha Derthick, The Influence of Federal Grants (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), particularly chapter 8.

2. While there were a number of professional organizations representing adult educators at this time including - the Adult Education Association (AEA), the National Education Association (NEA), through its Division on Adult Education, the National University Extension Association (NUEA), and NAPAE - it was the latter, representing public school adult educators that was clearly the leader. Originally created in 1952 as a unit within AEA, NAPSAE discontinued its affiliation in 1953

becoming a department within NEA in 1956; in 1969 it became a national affiliate; and finally in 1970 was renamed the National Association for Public Continuing Adult Education. The prime reason for this checkered development was the increasing concern of public school adult educators that their interests were not adequately represented by the more general emphasis of the other associations, particularly AEA. For the details of this development see Malcolm Knowles, The Adult Education Movement in the U.S. revised edition (Huntington, N.Y.: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1977), 230-232; and Robert Luke, "National Association for Public Continuing and Adult Education" in The Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. II, by Lee Deighton (New York: The MacMillan Co. and The Free Press, 1971), pp. 492-493.

3. Many details of the work of the 1963-1964 NAPSAE/NEA Legislative Committee and the less visible actors such as Tom McLernon was provided in a letter from Ray Ast former member of the Committee. Much documentary material can be found in the Archives, Department of Adult Education, Montclair State College, N.J.

4. The concept of human capital generated a plethora of publications. The leading proponents included Theodore Shultz, The Economic Value of Education (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), and Gary Becker, Human Capital (New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1964); with innumerable articles and monographs appearing with great regularity since the 1960s. Fritz Machlup went so far as to state that "If a mass movement for adult education can be stirred up, the rate of return on this investment may be much higher than that on other education outlays." See his Education and Economic

Growth (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970), p. 30.

5. For a critical review of the concept of functional literacy see Donald L. Fisher, Functional Literacy and the Schools (Washington: HEW and NiE, January 1978).

6. The Council of State Directors of Adult Education was organized in 1966 to achieve some balance in working with the federal government in the administration of the recently enacted Adult Basic Education Act. According to John Holden this group was reorganized and located within NAPSAE at the behest of the Council of Chief State School Officers. See his "Adult Education and the Public School" in Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900, Vol. II, ed. by Edgar Fuller and Jim Pearson (Washington: National Education Association, 1969), pp. 307-344.

7. The Division was established in 1955 as the Adult Education Section headed by Ambrose Caliver who described the Section's role as one that "gives consultative services and provides advisory services as requested." See Ambrose Caliver, et al, "Adult Education Activities of Government Agencies" in Handbook of Adult Education in the United States, ed. by Malcolm Knowles (Washington: Adult Education Association, 1960), p. 243.

References

1. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Intergovernmental Relations in the Poverty Program. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.

2. Bailey, Stephen K. Education Interest Groups in the Nation's Capital. Washington: American Council on Education, 1975.

3. Berke, Joel and Michael W. Kirst. Federal Aid to Education. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath Co., 1972.

4. Eidenberg, Eugene and Ray D. Morey. An Act of Congress. New York: W.W. Norton & Co. Inc., 1969.

5. Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder, 1970.

6. Griffith, William and Ronald Cervero, "The Adult Performance Level Program: A Serious and Deliberate Examination," Adult Education 27 (Summer, 1977), 209-224.

7. Harmon, David. "Illiteracy: An Overview." Harvard Educational Review. 40 (May, 1970), 226-243.

8. Kennedy, John F. "Special Message to the Congress, February 6, 1962", in Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States. John Kennedy 1962. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963, pp. 110-117.

9. Levitan, Sar. The Great Society's Poor Law: A New Approach to Poverty. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.

10. Mangum, Garth L. Editor. The Manpower Revolution: Its Policy Consequences. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1965.

11. Mezirow, Jack. "Professional Misgivings About Adult Basic Education" World Education Reports, (September, 1978), 6-8.

12. Murphy, Jerome. "Title I of ESEA: The Politics of Implementing Federal Education Reform." Harvard Education Review, 41 (February, 1971), 35-63.

13. Orfield, Gary. Congressional Power: Congress and Social Change. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1975.

14. Price, Hugh Douglas. "Race, Religion and the Rules Committee: The Kennedy Aid-to-Education Bills" in the Uses of Power. Edited by Alan F. Westin. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1962. Pp. 1-71

15. Robinson, James. The House Rules Committee. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co. Inc., 1963.

16. Summerfield, Harry. Power and Process. Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1974.

17. Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity. The Disadvantaged Poor: Education and Employment. Washington: Chamber of Commerce of U.S., 1966.

18. Thomas, Norman C. Education in National Politics. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1975.

19. Ulin, Jessie. "A design To Evaluate Program and Administrative Effectiveness" in Adult Basic Education Research Seminar. Columbus: Ohio-Wisconsin Cooperative, 1976. pp 51-56

20. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Department of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare Appropriations for 1979. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, 95 Cong., 2d sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1978.

21. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Adult Basic Education. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives on H.R. 10191, 87th Cong., 2d sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962.

22. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Adult Education. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives on H.R. 15, 95th Congress., 1st sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1977.

23. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 88th Cong., 2d sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964.

24. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. H. Report 1458, 88th Cong., 2d sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964.

25. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Education Amendments of 1978. H. Rept. 95-1753, 95th Cong., 2d sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1978.

26. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Education Amendments of 1974. H. Rept. 95-1137, 93rd Cong., 2d sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1974.

27. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Education Amendments of 1978. Conf. Rept. 95-1753, 95th Cong., 2d sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1978.

28. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives on H.R. 13160 and H. R. 13161, 89th Cong., 2d sess. Part I and Part 2, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

29. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969. Conf. Rept. 91-937, 91st Cong., 2d sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1970.

30. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Examination of The War on Poverty Program. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives 89th Cong., 1st sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

31. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Manpower Development and Training Act. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 88th Cong., 1st sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.

32. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. 1966 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 89th Cong., 2d sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.

33. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Part 21: The Administrations's Proposals For Elementary and Secondary Education. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1978.

34. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Human Resources. Education Amendments of 1977. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Human Resource, Senate on S. 1753, 95th Cong., 1st sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1977.

35. Yarmolinsky, Adam. "The Beginnings for OEO" in On Fighting Poverty: Perspectives From Experience. Edited by James Sundquist. New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1969. Pp. 34-51.